Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Lyrasis Members and Sloan Foundation

http://www.archive.org/details/messageofjohnlee1880carr

Md. General Assembly

[Document A.]

BY THE HOUSE OF DEEGATES,
JANUARY 8th, 1880.
Read and ordered to be printed.
By order,
MILTON Y. KIDD,
Chief Clerk.

MESSAGE

OF

JOHN LEE CARROLL,

GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND,

TO THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

At its Regular Session, January, 1880.

ANNAPOLIS:
WILLIAM T. IGLEHART & CO., STATE PRINTERS.
1880.

12469

Maryland
F
87
.M3
1880

MESSAGE.

Gentlemen of the Senate and House of Delegates:

I beg leave to submit for your consideration the following exhibit of the business and condition of the State during the last two years.

If I have gone somewhat more into detail than is customary, my excuse must be the great importance of many of the subjects to which I wish to refer.

We may consider it a fortunate circumstance that with all the depreciation of values and the great depression of trade, which has been universal during the last six years, the State has suffered such small loss in her investments, and that the burdens of taxation have been materially reduced.

The direct tax which was repealed in 1872 has not been re-enacted and the revenue derived by the State from taxation is applied only to the support of the Public Schools and the payment of interest on the Public Debt.

THE FINANCES.

The report of the Comptroller for 1878, which is herewith submitted, will show the following condition of the Treasury at the end of that fiscal year:

Balance in the Treasury September 30th, 1877	$397 981 13
Receipts for fiscal year ending September 30th, 1878	2 295,263 79
Total amount	$2,693 244 92
Disbursements for fiscal year ending Sept. 30th, 1878	2 489,079 14
Leaving a balance in the Treasury Sept. 30th, 1878, of	204 165 78

173501

Of the above receipts it may be stated that the sum of $571,080 was derived from loans issued under the Acts of 1872 and 1878 for the redemption of the overdue State debt and for the relief of the Treasury. This sum should be deducted from the gross receipts, as follows:

Amount of year's receipts	$2,295,263 79
Less amount of loans	571,080 00
Balance available	1,724,183 79
Add balance in Treasury	397,981 13
Total available for expenses of the State	$2,122,164 92

The receipts into the Treasury were derived from the following sources:

Taxes	$1,029,961 64
Licenses	469,435 18
Loans	571,080 00
Interest and R. R. dividends	152,687 40
Miscellaneous	2,712 97
Excess of fees	13,389 29
Interest on Personal acct	18,280 10
Fines and forfeitures	4,468 54
Live Stock Scales	13,911 22
Tobacco Inspection	1,607 25
Agricultural Scrip	7,053 44
Bank stock dividends	2,915 03
Grain Weighing	6,469 25
Hay Scales	1,292 48
Total	$2,295,263 79

The disbursements were for the following purposes:

Schools, Colleges and Academies	$ 660,175 87
Interest on Public Debt	653,326 80
Redemption of overdue debt	193,646 46
Advanced on certificate of loan	125,000 00
Special appropriations, including riots and for repairs on State House	186,024 67
Bounties and Pensions	41,764 16
Cost of Legislature printing and publishing	188,854 24
Cost of State Government, including Oyster Force	257,508 85
Charitable and Reformatory Institutions	114,150 00
Expense of Virginia Boundary Commission	9,500 00
Agricultural Societies and Library	7,094 68
Annapolis Water Co	622 00
Construction and repairs	51,411 41
Total	$2,489,079 14

In order to get at the actual expenditures during the year 1878, the amount paid to take up the last of the overdue debt in London, should be deducted from the general disbursements, as follows :

General disbursements	$2,489 079 14
Amount paid for overdue	193,646 46
Balance	$2 295,432 68

It will be thus seen that the *actual* expenditures for the year 1878 amounted to $2,295,432.68. It should be borne in mind, however, that a large portion of this expense arose from construction and repairs of public buildings like the State House and House of Correction, suppression of the riots, and various other purposes which cannot be classed as among the ordinary expenditures of the State government.

The receipts and disbursements for the fiscal year ending September 30th, 1879, were as follows :

Balance in Treasury September 30th, 1878	$ 204,165 88
Receipts for fiscal year ending September 30th, 1879	2,126,326 37
Total	$2 330,492 25
Total disbursements for same time	1 774,283 26
Leaving a balance in the Treasury on Sept. 30th, 1879	$ 556,208 99

The receipts into the Treasury were from the following sources :

RECEIPTS.

Taxes	$ 1,076,830 51
Loans	250,000 00
Licenses	474,768 94
Dividends and interest	154,799 87
Annuity Northern Central R. R. Co.	90,000 00
Agricultural College Scrip	7,015 82
Maryland Penitentiary	6 356 36
State wharves	4 508 93
Grain weighing	3,817 17
Miscellaneous	2,818 38
Live Stock Scales	11 771 61
Fines and forfeitures	7,031 93
State Tobacco Inspections	3,035 65
Excess of fees	14,821 18
Premium on Loan	18,750 00
Total	$2,126,326 37

The classification of the disbursements for 1879 would be about the same as in 1878. If we deduct from the total expenditure the amount required for the Public Schools and Colleges and interest on the Public Debt, amounting in the aggregate to $1,212,099.54, there will remain as the sum expended for the ordinary purposes of the State government, including donations to reformatory and agricultural societies, &c., $512,084.25.

RECAPITULATION.

Total receipts for 1878, including balance in Treasury	$2,693,244 92
Total disbursements	2,489,079 14
Balance	$ 204,165 78
Total receipts for 1879, including balance in Treasury	$2,330,492 25
Total disbursement	1,774,283 26
Balance in Treasury September 30th, 1879	$ 556,208 99

The total disbursements from the Treasury for the last seven years has been as follows:

1873	2,287,083 36
1874	2 276,906 35
1875	2,436,075 46
1876	2,676,810 66
1877	2 112,646 89
1878	2,489,079 14
1879	1,774,283 26

From this statement it will be seen that there was a decrease in the expenditures for 1879 of $714,795.88 as compared to 1878 and of $902,527.40 as compared with the expenditures of 1876.

This is a most gratifying result and reflects high credit upon the economical and judicious management of the Treasury Department.

The receipts and expenditures on account of the Contingent Fund of the Executive will be found, on examination, to have been as follows:

Amount appropriated from Jan. 1st, 1878 to Sept. 30th, 1878	$ 5 625 00
Amount for fiscal year ending Sept. 30th, 1879	7,500 00
Total	13,125 00
Disbursements	6,385 28
Leaving a balance in the Treasury Sept. 30th, 1879 of	$ 6,739 72

The appropriations for 1878 and 1879 were made by the Legislature of 1878 to conform to the fiscal year which ends on the 30th September, they having run heretofore with the calendar year.

The amount appropriated for the Contingent Fund, as stated above, ($13,125,) was therefore for twenty-one months, from January, 1878, to Sept. 30th, 1879.

It will be seen that less than half of this sum has been expended, and the balance, $6,739.72, reverted to the Treasury on 30th September, 1879.

To the disbursement above stated should be added the sums expended from January 1st, 1878, to the time when the new appropriation went into effect.

The Treasury Relief Loan, ($500,000,) which was negotiated on most favorable terms in 1878, to make up the deficiencies caused by loss of revenue has been, in great part, repaid to the State by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, in the settlement of the amount agreed upon for arrears of capitation tax. This tax was always accounted as income, and the bonds of the company to the amount of $366,000 have been delivered to the State, and can readily be converted into money, at their par value. A dividend of ten per cent. per annum is now also regularly paid upon the State's interest, $550.000, in the Washington Branch of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company. This dividend was suspended for several years, and its loss to the Treasury was seriously felt.

The interest upon the mortgage of the Susquehanna and Tide Water Canal, amounting to $60,000 a year, remains still unpaid and although the right of the State to take possession of the property is complete, it becomes a grave question what action can be taken to secure the best results. I recommend the subject to your careful considera-

tion, with the hope that some plan may be devised to secure this large interest to the State.

The funded debt of the State appears from the report of the Comptroller to be as follows:

Sterling debt bearing interest at 5 per cent	$ 4,432,222 24
Currency debt bearing 5 per cent	186,684 88
Debt bearing 3 per cent	269,000 00
Debt bearing 6 per cent	6,371,700 23
Total amount	$11,259,607 35

As an offset to this debt the State holds stocks and bonds upon which interest is promptly paid, amounting to $3,585,327.17, leaving as the net debt upon which interest has to be provided, $7,674,280.18.

The following stocks and bonds held by the State, which heretofore have been classed as productive, are now put down as unproductive, the payment of interest having ceased:

Stock in Bohemia Bridge Co	$ 15,876 99
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co	81,250 00
Bonds of Columbia & Port Deposit R. R. Co	60 000 00
Susquehanna & Tidewater Canal Co. mortgage	1,000,000 00
Total	$ 1,157,126 99

The large amount of unproductive assets owned by the State, amounting in the aggregate to $25,000,000, would, if sold, be more than sufficient to provide for our entire indebtedness.

The Defense Loan which was negotiated for the payment of bounties in 1868, will fall due in 1883. By its terms it can be provided for and taken up at any time after ten years from the date of issue. I recommend that provision be made at this session to retire this loan by the issue of one for a similar amount bearing five per cent. interest, payable in fifteen years. The credit of the State is so justly high that a loan of this character could, I am told, be readily negotiated and there would be a saving in interest of a considerable sum.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPERTY AND COLLECTION OF THE STATE'S REVENUE.

The valuation of the property of the State for the year 1879 is $466,470,995.

To this should be added the basis of stock and assets of corporations valued by the Tax Commissioner at $42,742,-896.01, which makes a total assessment for taxation of $509,213,891.

The Tax Commissioner, an officer created by the Act of 1878, Chap. 178, has relieved the Treasury Department of the duty of assessing the stocks and property of the various corporations of the State, and his report indicates an increase in the valuation of corporate assets, including their real estate for the year 1879, over 1877, of $12,331,464.

By the same Act of Assembly the counties now get the benefit derived from the taxation of the real estate owned by corporations which is situated within their limits. The tax on this property was formerly included in the assessment of the shares of stock, and no local advantage accrued to the counties.

There is an increased valuation of $37,358,577, over the basis for 1876, independent of the assessment of corporations, which is very favorable when it is remembered how greatly the values of real estate were depreciated in 1876, and how eagerly the holders of personal property sought to avoid taxation.

When the late assessment was made, a great number of persons, acting under the advice of their counsel, refused to make returns of stocks and bonds held by them and issued by corporations of other States, on the ground that they were not taxable in Maryland.

The decision of our Court of Appeals has settled forever the question as to the right of the State to tax this

class of securities, and it remains now for the Appeal Tax Court and the County Commissioners to renew their efforts to include all such property in the corrected assessment of the city and counties. It is supposed that the amount is very large.

The power given to the Appeal Tax Court by the Act of 1878, Chapter 178, to revise and to correct annually the assessment of property in the city of Baltimore has not as yet been exercised efficiently, partly owing to the want of machinery for the purpose and partly from the fact that the revision was commenced too late to include the whole city. It is hoped that the provisions of this law may be strictly carried out and that additional force will be allowed the Appeal Tax Court by the municipal authorities so that an annual revision of the assessment can be easily made.

In this way alone can the city and State receive from year to year the advantage of an increased value of its property, and at the same time full justice will be done to the taxpayer.

I am satisfied that an annual revision of the values of real and personal property in the counties and the city of Baltimore can be so perfected as to become, in a short time, more efficient and less expensive than the present system of decennial assessments.

Whatever may be the opinion entertained as to the propriety of this view in reference to the annual revision of the assessment, I am sure that the experience of all who have given thought to the subject, would lead them to the adoption of some radical change in the manner of collecting the revenues derived from State taxation.

If this revenue could be collected and paid over promptly, one of the greatest difficulties which the Treasury Department has to contend with would be avoided.

Under the present system of looking to the collectors of the counties and of the city of Baltimore for the collection and payment of the State taxes, the officers of the Treasury can never rely upon any certain amount of revenue at a specified date, and too frequently these delays of collection occur at the very time when large sums are needed to defray the expenses of the Public Schools or other equally important necessities. The disbursements, for example, on account of interest on the Public Debt, Schools, and the Civil list are always very large at certain seasons of the year, and we would naturally look to the revenues from taxes (as the State levy is made in June) to supply a great portion of this demand.

It generally happens, however, that a very small part of the taxes are collected at the times when most needed, and the State Treasury is often placed at great disadvantage by the delay of the local officers in making payments.

We find that the Comptroller always reports large sums as due from Collectors for many years past, showing that there is never any certainty as to how much of the State's revenue can be relied upon.

There can be no doubt that great relief would be afforded were these payments promptly made, and the question arises what is the practical remedy for this evil of delay and uncertainty?

It cannot be denied that the lien of the State for the taxes due by her citizens should have preference over all other claims, and that she should not be allowed to suffer from any failure on the part of local officers to provide what is so justly her own. In this view I would suggest that a sum equal to the usual levy of the State or a gross sum based upon the valuation of the property be made a charge upon each municipality and county, and that the

City officers and County Commissioners who receive the taxes be compelled by law to pay over to the State Treasury the amount levied for each city and county within a specified and reasonable time.

If this could be made a requirement of law the local officers would be urged to greater activity in the collection of the county revenues by the knowledge that the claims of the State must first be paid.

This system has been carried into practice in some of the States and notably in Massachusetts where the revenues are collected without delay.

It seems very clear that some such positive plan must soon be resorted to as the present mode of collecting divides the responsibility and causes great loss.

It may be asked, why are not the collectors, who give a sufficient bond, made to pay over more promptly? the answer would be that while it is the duty of the State's attorneys to prosecute these claims, there would appear to be many reasons why this duty is often neglected.

What these reasons are will perhaps readily occur to those who are familiar with the workings of our local politics, but the result is often an entire loss of the claim, and almost always a serious delay in payment.

PROCEEDINGS IN THE COURTS IN THE CASES IN WHICH THE STATE IS INTERESTED.

I communicate the following information in reference to proceedings in the Courts, conducted by the Attorney General, in which the State is interested, or in which questions were decided, which will serve as a guide to future legislation.

Since my last message the Court of Appeals has decided as follows:

1. That the stock, franchises and property of the Annapolis and Elk Ridge Railroad Company are not exempted from taxation.

2. That the stock, property, franchises and gross receipts represented or earned by the entire line of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company between Baltimore and the Ohio river, and all buildings and works necessary for the operation of the Railroad Company within the meaning of its charter, are exempted from taxation. But that buildings owned by the Company which were used in the business of warehousing were liable to taxation; that hotels belonging to the Company used as places of summer resort, and interests acquired by the Company in connecting roads were liable to taxation; that interests in steamships and other corporations owned by the Company and all its interests in lines of railway built by it under franchises acquired subsequent to the date of its original charter were subject to taxation.

These principles having been settled by the Court, the General Assembly thought proper, at its session in 1878, on the application of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, to take up the whole question of the relations between the State and that Company, and to adjust them in the manner set forth in the Act of 1878, Chapter 155, with the details of which settlement your Honorable Body is already familiar.

The controversy between the State and the Northern Central Railway Company, in relation to the exemption from taxation claimed by them, has been decided by the Court of Appeals in favor of the State, and against the exemption which the company has claimed.

The question, it is understood, will be carried by the company, to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Suggestions have, however, been made, on the part of that company, of a desire to reach an amicable adjustment of the matters in controversy between itself and the State.

The subject is commended to the attention of the General Assembly with the hope that some reasonable adjustment may be concluded.

3. Shares in building associations owned by residents of this State, have been declared to be subject to valuation and assessment, although the whole capital of such association is invested in mortgages.

4. All bonds of other States, and of municipal and other corporations, owned by residents of Maryland, have been decided to be completely within the taxing powers of this State.

5. The bonds of all railroad and other corporations, which are secured by a mortgage or mortgages upon property which is not wholly within this State, are, when owned by residents of Maryland, subject to valuation and assessment here.

6. All shares of stocks in corporations incorporated by other States, are subject to valuation and assessment in this State, whether such shares of stock were exempt from taxation by the State creating such corporation or not.

A considerable number of questions, in criminal law, have been adjudicated by the Court of Appeals, which, though important to the general administration of justice, require no particular mention from me at this time.

The Revenue Acts of 1876 and 1878 were largely tentative in their scope and purpose. Under their provisions an opportunity has been afforded to determine the greater number of those questions relating to taxation, which had been previously left in doubt.

I am advised by the Attorney General that the Revenue Acts of 1876 and 1878, will need but little alteration to bring them in precise accord with the later ruling of our Court of Appeals and of the Supreme Court of the United States, upon the subjects to which they refer. I do not doubt but that you will be able to make such changes as are needed to perfect the Revenue Laws of this State, and to distribute more equally the burdens of taxation among its people. I cannot close this subject without referring to the untiring labor and great ability and zeal which has been displayed by the Attorney General in the discussion and final settlement of these most important questions; and we may well congratulate ourselves that the public have so far appreciated his valuable services, as to honor him for the second time with the duties of that responsible position.

TOBACCO WAREHOUSES AND INSPECTIONS.

The following table will exhibit the receipts and disbursements of the State Tobacco Warehouses during the last four years:

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements of Tobacco Warehouses for Four Years.

	Fiscal Year 1876.	Fiscal Year 1877.	Fiscal Year 1878.	Fiscal Year 1879.
Gross Receipts from all Warehouses	$139,354 38	$109,477 85	$124,032 03	$101,013 85
Gross Disbursements from all Warehouses	118,778 81	102,226 39	121,404 71	97,144 28
Net Earnings in each Fiscal Year	20,566 57	7,251 46	2,627 32	3,874 57
Add amount due Sept. 30th, of previous year, pd. soon after.	2,053 70	9,433 90	945 15	1,965 22
Net Earnings and Balance from previous year	22,620 27	16,685 36	3,572 47	5,839 79

Aggregate Salaries, $15,000 a year, (4 years)	$60,000 00
Amounts actually paid including amounts due September 30th, and paid soon after, (4 years)	48,717 89
Showing a deficiency in the 4 years of	$11,282 11

From this it will be seen that the receipts have not been sufficient to meet the disbursements for labor, and to pay the salaries of the inspectors—the deficiency in this respect amounting to $11,288.11. I renew most earnestly the recommendation made in my last message, to change the present system of the inspection of tobacco.

I have become entirely satisfied that the abuses are very great; that they have existed for many years, and have been confined to no particular party; that false packing is encouraged by the present law, and that careless inspections, and extravagant employment of labor, have greatly reduced the value of this important product, and increased the cost of its shipment. A careful analysis of the number of hands employed in each house, of the cost of labor, and the amount of work performed for many years past, presents some curious results, conclusive, in my judgment, of the absurdity of continuing the present system.

It will be found, on examination, that the average amount of tobacco received and shipped for seven years ending September, 1878, has been fifty-two thousand seven hundred and fifty-eight hogsheads per annum or an aggregate of three hundred and sixty-nine thousand three hundred and six hogsheads.

The amount expended for labor alone to handle and inspect this tobacco has amounted during this time to $532,532, or an annual average of about $76,000.

This, divided among the five houses would be $15,200 for each house, and, allowing three hundred working days in the year, would be over $50 per day, equal to a daily average of twenty-five laborers at $2.00 per day or one hundred and twenty-five laborers for all the houses.

The shipment of tobacco, according to the above statement for this force of one hundred and twenty-five men,

would be about one hundred and seventy-six hogsheads per day or one and three-eighths hogsheads per man per day.

If this amount of work were doubled, for receiving, inspecting and lofting the tobacco coming in, it would only make the average two and three-quarters hogsheads per day for each man.

It must be remembered that this remarkably small amount of work and high average of pay does not include clerk hire, nail bills, incidentals, or the salaries of the inspectors and clerks. These items amount to an aggregate in the same time of $326,820 more, or an annual sum of $46,688, equal to an addition of $9,330 for each house which makes up a total cost of $81 per day to run it.

It will also be found that the total receipts during this time have exceeded the disbursements by only $69,313, thus leaving the sum of $35,687 to be paid from the general Treasury to make up the salaries of the inspectors, which amount to $15,000 a year.

In 1870 the committee appointed by the House of Delegates to examine into the condition of the tobacco warehouses reported unanimously in favor of abolishing compulsory inspections and of placing the entire business in the hands of private individuals.

The abuses are recited at some length, and a number of responsible witnesses were called to testify before the committee.

There was no witness who did not agree that the warehouses could be rented to most responsible people for $20,000 to $40,000 a year, and bond, with ample security, would be given to comply with any reasonable condition which the Legislature might impose for the protection of the planter.

It was the opinion of both inspectors and dealers that the standard of Maryland tobacco was lowered by the

present system, and that wherever the inspection was conducted by private individuals the samples could be relied on.

These abuses are not of recent growth, but were shown by that investigation to have long existed. Mr. Samuel Adams testified: "I have been connected with tobacco warehouses under one of the best administrations and one of the worst known.

"Under Governor Hicks' administration I have known one hundred hands employed more than required, under orders from headquarters, for political purposes, who were dismissed after the election."

Mr. Perkins, who had been five years inspector and eleven months chief clerk, was asked: "Do you think that the inspection of tobacco can be so managed as to produce a handsome net revenue to the Tobacco Fund?"

"Taking a practical business view of the matter, it can be done; but under a political view, it cannot."

"What do you think of leasing out the warehouses?"

"I think it would be of decided advantage to the trade, and would be of great benefit to the planters; the warehouses can be leased for twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars per annum without any expense to the Tobacco Fund. I would take them myself at that price, and give bond in a penalty of $100,000, with the best security, for its payment, and pay up quarterly into the Treasury. I have been much annoyed by politicians pressing upon me more labor than I needed; the pressure is so great at times as to be irresistible; with four efficient clerks the whole clerical business of a house can be performed, dispensing with sample tyer and finder."

In my judgment the objections to the system lie still deeper than its connection with politics, bad as that has been found.

I maintain that the policy of the State should be to interfere as little as possible with the business interests of the community, and that active competition in every branch of trade is the only true restraint which will secure to the public the cheapest and most efficient service.

This view of the freedom of trade from the trammels of law and State interference has been generally adopted throughout the country, and there is no reason why Maryland should continue to be bound by a policy which all admit to be imbecile and defective.

I would recommend that the present law be repealed, and that the warehouses be leased under such restrictions as the Legislature may suggest. If this can be accomplished a system of private inspection would grow up in the interest of the buyer and the planter, and in time we would have, what works so efficiently in Louisville and Cincinnati, a Tobacco Exchange, under the control of which the inspectors would be compelled to serve.

Should the Legislature, after a full examination of the subject, determine to adhere to the present law, I recommend that the inspectors and officers be compelled to look to the receipts alone for the payment of their salaries, and that under no circumstances should they or anyone connected with the warehouses have any claim upon the Treasury.

It is a great wrong that the public Treasury should be made to pay for any deficiency arising from this source, where the receipts are known to be so abundant.

I recommend that the offices of Weigher General and weighers of grain be abolished. It is true, that as they exist at present, they are not a charge upon the Treasury, but they are of no value whatever to the public, and should not be continued, on the principle that every man

ought to be able to attend to his own business without the assistance of the State.

STATE CATTLE SCALES.

The returns from the State Cattle Scales have been very satisfactory for the last two years.

Amount paid into Treasury for year ending Sept.. 1878	$13,911 22
Amount paid for 1879	11,771 61
Total	$ 25,682 83

The receipts for 1879 were somewhat reduced, owing to the fact that the dealers in hogs declined for some time to pay the charges for weighing them, and contended that as the law did not apply to the packers of pork, they too would not be bound by it.

The decision of Judge Garey, delivered in November, satisfied them on this point, and the arrears, amounting to over $4,000, have since been paid, thus swelling the receipts for 1879 to upwards of $15,000.

It is suggested that a slight alteration in the law would compel the packers also to pay the charges upon animals slaughtered here, which was evidently the purpose of the Act.

The omission of a penalty for non-compliance has caused the State to lose the revenue from this source.

I recommend that the bond of the Weighmaster be increased to $10,000, or that he be required to make monthly, instead of quarterly reports, to the Comptroller, and that the number of employees at the scales should be more closely regulated by law.

While it is true that under existing management a certain revenue to the Treasury has been derived from the scales, it appears to me that it would be well for the Legislature to take into consideration the important question of repealing the compulsory features of the present law in reference to weighing cattle sent to this market for sale.

The position which the City of Baltimore now holds as a shipping port, and the great facilities which our large railway connections afford for transportaion from the west, would undoubtedly enable us, in a short time, to create here a market for cattle, similar to that in New York, Buffalo, or Cincinnati.

Every encouragement should be given to build up this trade, and no one who is familiar with its advantages elsewhere, would doubt the profit to the city and the farmers of the State, to be derived from thc establishment in Baltimore of an extensive cattle market, either for shipment or for distribution to other centres.

This result however cannot be effected so long as the laws of Maryland require a tax to be paid for weighing cattle brought into this State for sale. All such laws clog the healthy operation of trade, and turn capital into other channels, which would naturally flow towards us.

In the interest therefore of the whole people, it would be well to consider carefully this question, so that we too may share the advantages which are now enjoyed by other States.

PUBLIC EDUCATION.

The practical working of the system of Public Schools in this State appears to be very efficient, and there is an annual increase in the numbers who receive the benefits of elementary education.

There is always a difficulty in making changes in reference to a subject of such great public interest as the education of our people, but there are one or two points in which the present School Law could be improved without any derangement of the general plan.

I called attention in my last message, to the fact that there was no power of supervision of the accounts of the

County School Commissioners placed anywhere under the present law.

They have the right to insist upon a levy being made for school purposes in the counties, over and above what is paid to them by the Comptroller, and are accountable to no one for the disbursement of these funds, except in so far as they make a report to the State Board of Education.

This Board has no power to dispute an item or to examine a voucher of the report, but must simply accept it as presented.

Although there is no reason to believe that in any part of the State there has been a misapplication of the School Funds, still I think there should be a power lodged with the State Board or County Commissioners, not only to examine the accounts and vouchers, but to check any extravagance that the County Boards may commit.

The composition of the State Board of Education is also, in my judgment, defective; at present, it is composed of the Examiners and Presidents of the County Boards, with the Principal of the Normal School. It appears to me that if this board is to have greater supervisory power, it should consist of persons entirely independent and disconnected with the Public Schools, as it might well happen, that the action of the members themselves, would be the subject of criticism.

The objection will apply at this time to the Principal of the Normal School, as, under the present, law this institution is the only one in the State whose accounts come under the supervision of the Board of Education.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE.

The success of this institution under its present head is all that could be desired.

The debt incurred under former administrations has long since been paid off, and the college has so risen in the estimation of the public, that it is now regarded as one of the most favored seats of learning in the State.

MARYLAND HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE AND COUNTY ALMSHOUSES.

It is with great pleasure that I submit to you the very satisfactory reports of the Board of Managers, the Treasurer and the Superintendent of the Hospital for the Insane.

The number of insane patients on November 1st, the end of the fiscal year, was three hundred and twenty-nine, which is shown to be an increase for the last two years of eighteen per cent. per annum.

The Treasurer reports that the Institution has not one dollar of indebtedness, and that there remains on hand a net available balance of $26,895.51.

It will be remembered, that for many years this Hospital was a serious burden to the State, and the small number of patients it contained in 1876, when the law was changed, indicated a want of confidence in the public mind as to its efficient management.

The report of the Board now shows that the building is crowded beyond its capacity, and urges strongly the importance of increased accomodations for this unfortunate class.

The pauper insane must necessarily always be a charge upon the charity of the State, and while it is satisfactory to see the improved condition of those who share the advantages of this institution, it is evident that there are many in the counties whose disease must become chronic for want of that curative treatment for which this Hospital was designed.

I therefore commend to the Legislature the wise suggestions of the Superintendent and Board of Managers,

and hope that this great charity, which is now so ably conducted, may extend in time to all who are so afflicted that they cannot protect themselves.

It is satisfactory to report that there has been a marked improvement in the condition of most of the almshouses and jails in the counties, which were so severely criticised two years ago by the Secretary of the State Board of Health. A statement from him will be submitted, showing the changes that have taken place since his first visit to the counties, and it is to be hoped that the evils complained of will all be removed at an early day.

HOUSE OF CORRECTION.

There was appropriated at the Session of 1878, "for the heating and cooking apparatus, water supply, cisterns and drains, gas supply and furniture for the House of Correction," the sum of $74,000.

The Board of Managers organized under the Act of 1878, on the 16th day of May, 1878, and immediately proceeded to equip and fit the House of Correction for the reception of prisoners

The various contracts were given out after advertisement and the fullest inquiry of the responsibility of the bidders.

It was found that a reliable and permanent supply of water could only be obtained by building a reservoir at a considerable distance from the stream and filling it by means of a steam pump. This reservoir, which was constructed according to the plans and under the supervision of R. K. Martin, Esq., City Engineer, contains one million two hundred and fifty thousand gallons of pure, delicious water which, flows directly into the building, and will furnish a most bountiful supply for whatever may be the future necessities of the institution..

The total cost of its construction was $17,600, and I am quite sure that an examination of the work itself will show how moderate was the price and how valuable have been the results accomplished.

The heating, cooking, laundry and gas apparatus were also constructed at a reasonable cost, and the building was fully equipped and ready for the reception of prisoners on the first day of January, 1879. A staff of officers was selected, and the practical operation of the prison was begun on that day.

Up to the first of December last the total number of committals were four hundred and ninety-three—three hundred and ten males, and one hundred and eighty-three females.

The total cost of maintaining the institution up to the end of the fiscal year, September 30th, has been $17,-918.91; this cost will no doubt be reduced as the system becomes perfected, and as experience will show where greater economy may be exercised. A statement in detail is appended showing the actual cost of maintaining the prisoners, of the supplies of clothing and the salaries of the officers.

The male prisoners have been employed principally in grading the land around the building, and the females in making up the uniforms and other suitable clothing. A large number have also been engaged in sewing upon contract work, from which the sum of $791,60 has been realized.

I suggest that an appropriation be made at an early day for the building of work shops on the premises, so that the prisoners may be employed in some useful occupation that will relieve the tax-payers of their support. In the present prosperous condition of business their labor could readily be hired out for a sum more than sufficient to defray the annual expense of the institution.

If it could be made self-sustaining like the penitentiary, encouragement would soon be given to build and equip the proposed additional wing, which would complete the original design and be of great value in the absolute separation of the sexes.

During the past summer the section of the law, which authorizes Justices of the Peace to commit "habitually disorderly" persons to the House of Correction, was called into question, and the claim was set up that it was unconstitutional.

Several persons were brought out upon writs of *habeas corpus*, and some were released. A test case was finally made, and argued by the Attorney General, before the Chief Justice of the State, who gave a formal opinion, sustaining the validity of the law.

The Judges generally have conformed to the opinion expressed by the Chief Justice, and have declined to grant applications for release, but one of the Associate Judges of Baltimore county has steadily maintained that the law is unconstitutional.

Acting upon this belief, he has granted writs of *habeas corpus* whenever application has been made, and has usually discharged the prisoners applying to him. Such a conflict of opinion brings the law into contempt, and I recommend that steps be taken to secure a judgment of the Court of Appeals, which must finally determine this question.

There appears to be some doubt as to the construction of the 9th section of the Act of 1878, chap. 415, in reference to who may be sentenced to the House of Correction by the Courts of this State, and I recommend that this section of the law be revised and its meaning more clearly defined.

A statement from the Architect, George A. Frederick, Esq., will show in detail the various expenditures for furn-

ishing and equipment which came under his supervision; also a general summary of the manner in which the whole appropriation was disbursed.

These sums of money were expended under the personal direction of the Board of Managers, and no purchases were made that did not meet with their approval.

MARYLAND PENITENTIARY.

The report from this important institution exhibits the same careful management which has marked its conduct for some years past.

It will be seen that the highest number of prisoners during the year was nine hundred and twenty-nine, and the average number eight, hundred and thirteen, of whom six hundred and ninety-three were kept constantly employed upon contract work.

There were only eighteen deaths during the year, about two per cent. of the inmates, and the loss of time from sickness was two and a half days in the year for each man.

This shows a remarkable sanitary condition, and taken in connection with the general good conduct of the prisoners, as stated by the Warden, we may be satisfied that the closest attention has been given to the institution.

The financial report presents a condition that must be highly gratifying to the tax-payers of the State.

The total cost of the support of the Penitentiary, for the year ending December 1st, has been $85,541.40, and the receipts from all sources for the same time, amounted to $98,543.25, showing a balance to the credit of the prison and due the Treasury of the State, of $13,001,85.

In addition to this, there has been earned by the prisoners for over-work the sum of $8,280.62, of which they will get the benefit as they serve out their time.

There will be found appended a statement of the cases in which Executive clemency has been exercised dur-

ing the past two years, and also the reasons which have guided me in every instance.

The appilcations for pardon have been very numerous, but I have generallyrequired a recommendation from the officers of the State who were present at the trial, and by this means the true facts have usually been disclosed.

The report of the Warden contains an interesting history of the origin and progress of the Maryland Penitentiary.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL COMPANY.

The damage that this important work sustained in November, 1877, caused by the disasterous flood in the Potomac River, has been thoroughly repaired, and the exposed points greatly strengthened and improved.

The reconstruction of Dam No. 4, was the most difficult and costly part of the work of repair, and was only completed within the past month.

The cost of these repairs, as stated in the report of the President and Directors for the year ending December 31st, 1878, was $199,190.46, and the cost for the present year is estimated at about $50,000, which includes the rebuilding of Dam No. 4.

As the principal of the tonnage of the Canal is derived from the coal trade, which has, in common with all other interests, been greatly depressed, there has necessarily been a considerable decrease in the revenues of the Company.

The coal tonnage for 1878 was six hundred and thirty thousand two hundred and ninety tons, being an increase over 1877 of twenty-seven thousand one hundred and ninety four.

The gross earning was	$289,013 17
An increase over 1877, of	87,709 92

The ordinary expenses for operating the Canal was $206,131.60, showing the net revenue over the usual ex-

penses to have been $82,081.57, which amount, together with the receipts from the sale of bonds authorized by an Act of the General Assembly, at its last Session, was applied to the payment of interest, repairs and betterments made necessary by the damage heretofore referred to.

The President and Directors in their last annual report state that they have sold seventy-seven bonds of $1,000 each, issued under the Act of 1878, chapter 58, at par.

During the present year the interruptions to trade in the mining regions, caused by the strike of the miners, have seriously interfered with the tolls of the Canal, but the activity in manufacturing interests during the past month, and the largely increasing demand for Cumberland coal at advanced prices, gives the best assurance for increased prosperity for the coming year.

THE OYSTER LAW.

In my last message I recommended a reduction in the salaries of the officers and crews of the steamer and the sloops which compose the Oyster Police force.

The subject was not acted on during the Session, and I regret to say that the revenues for the last two years have fallen short of the expenditures by the sum of $15,667.67. This loss falls directly on the Treasury of the State, for although the Comptroller reports a balance to the credit of the so-called Oyster Fund, of $235,000, no such balance has ever existed in fact, and the accounts are kept separate only for the sake of statistical reference.

The following have been the receipts and disbursements during the last two years:

Disbursements for 1878	$41,683 86
Receipts for 1878	38,426 83
Deficiency for 1878	3,257 03
Disbursements for 1879	44,079 76
Receipts " "	31,969 12
Deficiency for 1879	12,410 64
Total deficiency in two years	15 667 67

Under the present law of 1874, the State Fishery Board have no discretion as to the number of vessels that are to be placed in commission, nor as to the salaries paid to the officers and crew.

I renew the recommendation made in my last message, that the whole bay be thrown open to dredging, and that the rivers alone be protected by the counties for the tongsmen. I would add to this the further suggestion that the sloops be given to the counties for the protection of their waters, and the steamer alone retained by the State, at reduced salaries, to secure the bay from the depredations of foreign and unlicensed dredgers. By this action our revenue would continue the same, but the expenditures would be reduced more than one-half.

MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA BOUNDARY LINE.

Complying with the Act of 1878, Chap. 374, I appointed Hon. Wm. J. Aydelotte, of Worcester county, a Commissioner on the part of Maryland, to act in concert with the Commissioner appointed by the Governor of Virginia, in surveying and causing the boundary line agreed upon by the arbitrators, to be marked and defined by suitable monuments.

At my request, the Secretary of War at Washington very kindly detailed Lieutenant D. W. Lockwood, of the Topographical Engineers of the United States, to run and mark the line. As no appropriation was made, the work could not be carried out, but I submit an estimate of its cost, by Lieutenant Lockwood, amounting to $3,600, which may serve somewhat as a guide to your Honorable Body in making an appropriation for this purpose.

With the line undefined, as it is at present, the value of the award is lost to both States, and there is constant liability that the parties who fish and dredge in these adjoining waters may come in conflict with each other.

I therefore hope that the General Assembly will take early steps to perfect the award which has been attended with so much expense and trouble.

MILITIA.

The Adjutant General reports that the whole force of the Militia consists of one full regiment in the City of Baltimore and a number of companies in the various counties, aggregating 1,400 men.

This organization, though not large, is thoroughly armed, equipped and well disciplined, and would doubtless be found equal to any emergency that might arise.

The cost of the military force has now been reduced to fifteen thousand dollars a year, which, in comparison with other States, must be considered a small appropriation.

THE STATE HOUSE.

At the Session of 1878, the sum of $15,000, was appropriated, and the Board of Public Works was directed to repair the dome and to complete the hall of the State House. This sum was $10,000 less than the estimate submitted by the architect, and after thoroughly repairing and repainting the dome at a cost of $12,430.77, it was found that the house could not be finished for the amount of the appropriation that remained unexpended, $2,569.23. It will require at least $10,000 to fit up the hall and entrance in a becoming way, and I hope it may not be left long in its present unfinished state.

The building itself is in a far better condition than it ever was before, and is in every way fitted for the uses of the State. The memories that surround it make it worthy of proper care and adornment, and there should be no objection to the expenditure of a reasonable sum for these purposes.

I wish to call the attention of the Legislature to the fact, that in the payment of bills incurred in furnishing

the State House the commissions of the architect amounting to $1,795, were not allowed. I cannot see on what ground this claim was not admitted. The architect was directed by the Board of Public works to select the furniture and to make designs for such part of it as had to be prepared. This task involved great labor and care, and the efficient way in which the work was done, entitled him to the compensation which was agreed upon by the Board. I hope, therefore, that your Honorable Body will order this just claim to be paid.

THE GREAT SEAL.

The new seal which I was directed by the Legislature of 1876 to have made, was completed, and has been in use for the last year. It conforms now in every respect to the original arms furnished the Province of Maryland in sixteen hundred and forty-eight, by Cecilius Lord Baron, of Baltimore. A sketch of the arms was executed with great care by R. G. Harper Pennington, Esq., and placed in the Senate Chamber, so that at any future time the true colors may be referred to with certainty.

REGISTRATION.

At the session of 1876, an earnest effort was made to enact a new registration law for the State. It was found, however, that the counties were satisfied with the enroll- of their voters, and they objected to the expense that a new registration would entail.

A simple revision of the lists was therefore ordered, and a law was passed making further subdivisions of the wards in Baltimore.

This law has not met the requirements of a large number of citizens, who contend that the original lists in the city, are so defective that they cannot be corrected, and that the only way to secure perfect fairness, is to require a new registration of the voters. As the constitution re-

quires a uniform system, a law directing a new registration, must apply to the whole State, and I therefore recommend in view of the great importance of such an act, to the City of Baltimore, that the objections which have been urged against it may be withdrawn.

FISH CULTURE.

I call the attention of the General Assembly to the two reports of the Commissioners of Fisheries, giving in detail the work done during the last two years.

This commission was organized six years ago, and as sufficient time has elapsed to test, in a measure, its actual success, and the prospect for the future, it will become necessary for you to determine whether the work shall be continued.

The large increase of shad which has been reported at various points where the artificial cultivation of this fish has been carried on, is certainly an indication of what can be accomplished.

I would direct your attention to the statistics given, showing the increase of this fish at the head of the bay, where the commission has worked on the largest scale.

The fact reported that the catch of shad by one of the large seines, in the neighborhood of Havre-de-Grace, in the year 1872, 1873 and 1874, was about 14,000, 12,000 and 16,000 respectively, had fallen off in 1878, to 7,000, and in 1879, has suddenly increased to over 23,000, is an indication that this large gain is from artificial cultivation.

This view is confirmed by the table given below, made by one of the agents of the gillers in this locality, showing the number of shad shipped from Havre-de-Grace, from 1870 to 1879 :

1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	1879.
48,537	30,101	62,451	48,295	50,246	40,150	35,539	47,150	50,310	75,525

The success in the experiments with the herring, and the discoveries in the artificial propagation of the rock, one of our most valuable fish, also indicates the capacity of this department to greatly increase our fish food.

A most important work performed by the commission was the investigations conducted in the lower bay, which resulted in the initiation of the artificial cultivation of the oyster.

The oyster interest is of so much importance to the State, that it should demand your most careful consideration.

The cultivation of oysters on the coast of France, has added greatly to the prosperity of that country.

Our magnificent bay yields a very large and valuable supply of food, and the depletion of some of the best beds, as shown in the report, is sufficient to cause us some apprehension for the future.

In my last message I recommended that the law be so changed as to provide for the appointment of only one commissioner.

I am satisfied that the work would be more effectually done by one person, who could have, subject to the approval of the Governor, entire control over the detail of its operations.

Under the present law, with two officers of equal power, a difference of opinion upon any important point, cannot easily be reconciled, and it might well happen that the work itself would be endangered from want of co-operation.

CONCLUSION.

In a few days I shall surrender to my successor the honorable office to which I was called four years ago. You will pardon me, if I express the belief, that certain results have been accomplished during that time, which cannot fail to be of permanent value to the State.

The great questions of how far the State can go in the exercise of its powers of taxation, regarding the property of individuals, and of corporations, have been asserted with emphasis, and absolutely decided by our Court of last resort.

The capacity of the Legislature to regulate, in a measure, the dealings of railroad companies with the business community, has likewise been defined with clearness and precision. Powerful corporations, whose vast properties have hitherto been exempt from all taxation, are now contributing their quota to the support of the government, and the various controversies which for so long a time have excited bitterness and angry dispute between the State and the corporate bodies of her own creation, have been terminated upon conditions honorable and just to both.

The laws have been enforced in the midst of great popular tumult and excitement, and the principle has been firmly maintained, that all evils must be redressed by the process of the law alone, and that the rule of the mob can have no place in the government of this State.

Our public institutions, educational, penal, reformatory and charitable, are to-day in a most prosperous condition, and are carrying out to the satisfaction of all, the purposes for which they were so wisely designed.

In spite of the bitterness of party spirit, we have shown that in our system of elections, each citizen can be secured the fair results of his elective franchise, and that whatever may be the reproaches cast upon the popular vote in other communities, they cannot be maintained in the chief city of this State.

In the administration of our finances, no extravagance has been committed in any department, and the credit of the State has been enhanced by the limits which have been placed upon the expenditure of its revenue.

We point again to substantial reform in the sentiment which I believe to be well nigh universal, that the patronage of the Executive should be abridged rather than increased; that the obsolete laws of compulsory inspection in reference to staple articles of trade, should be blotted from our Statute Books, and that the business interests of the community should be separated as far as possible from all interference of the government.

Let us hope that these results may prove to be of practical value in distributing more equally the burdens among our people.

The evils of whatever bad legislation may exist in the Federal councils, do not fall so directly, nor so heavily upon us, if the local sources from which we take our daily teachings are kept pure and guarded.

If each State can secure to itself the blessings of uncorrupted government at home, we would soon find that a far broader view will pervade our National Assembly, and the practical interests of the whole people would forbid those sectional appeals which have so often threatened us with disaster.

JOHN LEE CARROLL.

Executive Chamber,
January 7th, 1880.

APPENDIX.

CONTAINING

PARDONS GRANTED AND LETTER OF ARCHITECT,

TOGETHER WITH

STATISTICAL REPORT OF EXPENDITURES, &c.,

OF HOUSE OF CORRECTION.

APPENDIX.

Pardons Granted.

Pardon granted January 18th, 1878.—Michael Carroll, convicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore county, at September Term, 1877, of assault and battery, and sentenced to the county jail for six months.

The application for pardon in this case was supported by the Judge and State's attorney, who stated that the evidence was very slight on which the prisoner was convicted, and that he had always borne a good character; he had served three months of his time and was recommended to clemency by the prosecuting witness, the party assaulted.

Pardon granted January 21st, 1878.—Wm. H. Thomas, colored, convicted in the Circuit Court for St. Mary's county, at December Term, 1874, of larceny, and sentenced to the penitentiary for five years.

In this case the prisoner had served three and a half years, was recommended by the Judge and State's attorney and a large number of respectable citizens, on the ground of his youth when the offense was committed; his conduct in prison was uniformly good.

Pardon granted January 21st, 1878.—David Lease, convicted in the Circuit Court for Frederick county, at September Term, 1877, of larceny, and sentenced to the county jail for six months.

This prisoner was recommended to executive clemency by his Honor, John A. Lynch, before whom the case was tried, by the State's attorney and a number of the most respectable citizens of Frederick, on the ground that he had served one half his term, and that he had a large family of utterly destitute children.

Nolleprosequi granted January 25th, 1878.—Elizabeth Poole, convicted in the Circuit Court for Frederick county, at September Term, 1877, of larceny, and held *sub curia*

This was an application for a nolleprosequi after a verdict of guilty. There existed such grave doubt as to the sanity of the prisoner that the two judges, Hons. Viers Bouic and John A. Lynch with the State's attorney and a number of respectable citizens urged the Executive to grant the petition; upon this representation by the officers of the State, the application was granted.

Pardon granted February 16th, 1878.—Henry C. Cook, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city at September Term, 1877, of rioting, and sentenced to jail for three months.

In this case the prisoner had served a portion of his time, when his wife met with an accident from the explosion of a coal-oil lamp, which nearly proved fatal. In this distressed condition, with several young children left utterly destitute, she applied through her friends for relief, and the case was considered one that called for the exercise of Executive clemency. The petition was supported by the recommendation of the visitors of the jail.

Pardon granted February 18th, 1878.—George S. Flashower, convicted in the Circuit Court for Carroll county, at September Term, 1877, of larceny, and sentenced to the penitentiary for eighteen months.

At the trial of the above case it seems that such grave doubts existed as to the guilt of the prisoner who was a German of most respectable connections in his own country, that he was especially recommended to Executive clemency by His Honor Judge Hayden, by whom he was alone tried, by the State's attorney of Carroll county, by the members of the Westminster bar, and the entire list of the jury for the term, and a large number of the most respectable citizens of Carroll county; supported by the recommendation of these gentlemen, on application of the German Consul General at Philadelphia, the prisoner was pardoned on condition that he would immediately leave the State and return no more.

Nolleprosequi granted February 26th, 1878.—Adam Spann, convicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore county, at October Term, 1877, of larceny.

Application for a nolleprosequi to suspend sentence after conviction was granted in this case, under the following circumstances:

The prisoner was convicted of the larceny of two barrels of oil, and the jury by whom he was tried signed the recommendation and declare that, although under their oaths they felt bound to bring in a verdict of guilty, they were unanimously of the opinion that a

nolleprosequi should be granted. This opinion was supported by the presiding Judge before whom alone the case was tried, by the prosecuting witness from whom the articles were taken, and a large number of most respectable citizens of Baltimore county, including the foreman of the Grand Jury.

Pardon granted February 26th, 1878.—Wm. Butler and Sam'l Short, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, September Term, 1877, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary until October 5, 1878.

The evidence in this case was of such a doubtful nature that His Honor Judge Brown, before whom these men were tried, earnestly recommended their pardon after serving four months of the term. Various affidavits of previous good character were filed.

Pardon granted March 15th, 1878.—John Gale, colored, convicted in the Circuit Court for Kent county, at October Term, 1869, of burglary and sentenced to the penitentiary for ten years.

In this case the prisoner was convicted with two other persons as accomplices who were sentenced for eight years and who served out their time; Gale had served nine years and on the recommendation of a large number of respectable citizens of Kent county, and of the fact of his long service and exemplary conduct while in prison, he was released.

Pardon granted March 15th, 1878.—John Dugan, convicted in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel county, at April Term, 1875, of conspiracy and sentenced to jail for three years upon record removed from Criminal Court for Baltimore city.

This prisoner had served out his term, within two months, and was released on the especial recommendation of the Board of Visitors of the jail on account of his good conduct during the term of service; he was pardoned to restore him to his right of citizenship.

Pardon granted March 15th, 1878.—Isaac Hecht, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at January Term, 1878, of indecent exposure and sentenced to jail for one year.

Pardoned on the recommendation of Judge Brown, who gave him the benefit of the previous good character which he established.

Pardon granted March 15th, 1878.—Sam'l Wooden, convicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore county, at October Term, 1875, of burglary and sentenced to the penitentiary for three years.

The prisoner in this case was recommended by a number of respectable citizens and by the prosecutor, and had served out his time within two or three months.

Pardon granted March 22nd, 1878.—James Lambright, convicted in the Circuit Court for Frederick county, at February Term, 1878, of receiving stolen goods and sentenced to the penitentiary for eighteen months.

The application in this case was made by Hon. John Richie, and the circumstances attending the conviction were attended with such doubt as to the real guilt of the party, that he was recommended to Executive clemency by Hon. John A. Lynch, the State's attorney, the Clerk of the Court of Frederick county and a very large number of the most respectable citizens of Frederick county; upon this strong recommendation and the further fact that his previous character was excellent, the pardon was granted.

Pardon granted April 2nd, 1878.—Alexander Brown, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at December Term, 1877 of larceny and sentenced to the city jail for six months.

A pardon was granted in this case upon the certificate of Dr. Hauck, resident physician of the jail, as to the desperate condition of the prisoner's health, on the recommendation of His Honor, Judge Brown and in view of the fact that he had served two-thirds of his time.

Pardon granted April 8th, 1878.—William Todd, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at September Term, 1877, of burglary and sentenced to the penitentiary until 1st October, 1880.

A pardon was granted to this prisoner on the recommendation of the State's attorney of Baltimore city, Hon. A. Leo Knott, who represented Todd as very young at the time of the offense and that his family were prepared to remove him from the State, application was granted on these terms.

Pardon granted April 8th, 1878.—John Leary, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at September Term, 1877, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary until the 8th day of November, 1878.

The pardon in this case was granted on the special recommendation of His Honor, Judge Brown and of the parties from whom the goods were stolen; the prisoner had served about half of his term.

Pardon granted April 17th, 1878.—Josiah W. Travers, convicted in the Circuit Court for Dorchester county, at November Term, 1876, of larceny, and sentenced to the penitentiary for three years and six months.

The prisoner in this case had served over two years of his term and was released upon the recommendation of many of the leading citizens of Dorchester county and the statement of the State's attorney, that since his conviction grave doubts had arisen in his mind as to the prisoner's guilt.

Pardon granted April 19th, 1878.—Newton Johnson and Seyton Johnson, convicted in the Circuit Court for Washington county, at May Term, 1877, of larceny, and sentenced to the penitentiary for eighteen months.

The value of the articles stolen by the prisoners in this case was $4.90, for which they were sentenced to the penitentiary for eighteen months; after one year's service the late Attorney General, Hon. A. K. Syester, who aided the prosecution, urged their pardon upon the Executive on account of the good character and industrious habits of the young men; as the petition was favored by a large number of the most respectable citizens of Washington county, under the circumstances it was granted.

Pardon granted May 1st, 1878.—Andrew Hammond, convicted in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel county, at October Term, 1877, of manslaughter and sentenced to the county jail for six months.

The pardon in this case was granted within a few days of expiration of his term, on application of His Honor, Judge Miller, and State's attorney for A. A. County.

Pardon granted May 9th, 1878.—Alonzo Keyser, convicted in the Circuit Court for Howard county, at March Term, 1875, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for six years, upon removed record from the Criminal Court of Baltimore city.

The prisoner in this case had served half his time, being sentenced for six years on two indictments; while the Judge, before whom he was tried, did not especially recommend him for pardon, he stated that he thought the punishment sufficient; his uniform good conduct in prison, and his distressed family and youth induced the Executive to pardon him on condition that he would leave the State.

Pardon granted May 9th, 1878.—Horace Beall, convicted in the Circuit Court for Frederick county, at September Term, 1874, of manslaughter and sentenced to the penitentiary for four years and six months.

The prisoner in this case was pardoned on special request of His Honor, Judge Lynch, together with the present and former State's attorneys, after serving more than two-thirds of his time.

Pardon granted June 5th, 1878 —Jacob Bonnet, convicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore county, at September Term, 1877, of assault with intent to kill, and sentenced to the penitentiary for two years.

In this case the most earnest representations were made to the Executive by a number of reputable people as to the excellent character always borne by the prisoner, and a strong appeal made by the pastor of his church, who declared him to have always been a most respectable man. This taken in connection with the fact that the party assaulted was unhurt and made the first attack induced the Executive to grant the petition.

Pardon granted June 7th, 1878.—Samuel Baggett, convicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore county, at September Term, 1878, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for two years.

The prisoner in this case was sentenced for two years and six months and after serving six months he was released on the application of the State's attorney and the Judge before whom he was tried.

Pardon granted June 12th, 1878.—Frederick Hagan and William Wright, convicted in the Circuit Court for Kent county, at April Term, 1878, for violation of the oyster law and sentenced to jail for two months and fined $50 each.

In this case the prisoners were sentenced to two months imprisonment in jail and a fine of $50 each, having served one month of the time and being highly recommended, as the offense was not a grievous one they were pardoned.

Pardon granted June 12th, 1878.—Richard Bundick, convicted in the Circuit Court for Somerset county, at April Term, 1869, of murder in the second degree and sentenced to the penitentiary for seventeen years.

This prisoner was sentenced to the penitentiary for seventeen years and had served nearly nine years of his term He was earnestly recommended to Executive clemency by the Board of Directors on the ground that his conduct had always been irreproachable and that he was in the last stages of consumption, a certificate to this effect was also filed by the physician of the penitentiary.

Pardon granted July 3rd, 1878.—William Tilghman, convicted in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel county, at October Term, 1877, of receiving stolen goods and sentenced to the penitentiary for eighteen months.

The presiding Judge at the trial of this case addressed a communication to the Executive in which he stated that the law was more severe for receiving stolen goods than for actually stealing them, and that in his opinion the prisoner had suffered sufficiently, and he recommended his pardon; the Judge was supported by the State's attorney.

Nolleprosequi granted July 3rd, 1878.—Chas. B. Gaylord and Jas. W. Knapp, indicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city at May Term, 1878 for conspiracy.

This was a highly important case, being connected with the trial of parties charged with conspiring to defraud the various railroad companies by selling fraudulent or stolen tickets. The parties above named were involved in the conspiracy but became witnesses for the State on the promise of the prosecuting officer to recommend that a nolleprosequi be entered in their cases. The matter was deemed of sufficient interest to the public to confirm the promise of the prosecuting attorney as is always customary in such cases.

Pardon granted July 18th, 1878.—George Barnes, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at January Term, 1878, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for one year,

The prisoner was found guilty of stealing an accordeon, the value of which was somewhat over five dollars; he was sentenced for one year to the penitentiary, and His Honor, Judge Brown, expressed in writing to me that he would have given him a lighter sentence had the law allowed any discretion; his pardon was urged also by the prosecuting witness, the physician testified to his suffering from ill health, and as he had served six months he was pardoned.

Pardon granted July 18th, 1878.—John Thomas Pearce, convicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore county, at December Term, 1877, of forgery and sentenced to the penitentiary for five years and three months.

This case was specially recommended by His Honor, Judge Grason, before whom the prisoner was tried, and mitigating circumstances were urged as a reason for pardon, The prisoner was sentenced for five years but this was the shortest term allowed by law;

he was recommended by a number of the jury who tried the case, by the person whose name was forged and by a large number of the most respectable citizens of Baltimore county.

Pardon granted August 7th, 1878.—Henry Rehmsnyder, convicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore county, at March Term, 1878, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for one year and six months.

This prisoner was convicted of the larceny of several articles of trifling value and was pardoned on the special recommendation of the Judge before whom he was tried.

Pardon granted August 7th, 1878.—George Scales, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at September Term, 1877, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary until the 9th of October, 1878.

A pardon was granted in this case two days before the expiration of the prisoner's term on the certificate of his good conduct, and for the further reason that being just of age it was not deemed well to deprive him of his right of suffrage for so small an offense.

Pardon granted August 30th, 1878.—Jas. F. Stewart, convicted in the Circuit Court for Somerset county, at April Term, 1873, of assault with intent to kill and sentenced to the penitentiary for ten years, upon removed record to Dorchester county.

Pardon was granted in this case on the recommendation of the two associate Judges before whom the case was tried, and a large number of respectable citizens, on condition that the prisoner would leave the State and not return.

Pardon granted September 10th, 1878.—Thomas Gibson, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at May Term, 1876, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for five years.

The above case was pardoned on the special recommendation o His Honor, Judge Brown, before whom the prisoner was tried.

Pardon granted September 10th, 1878.—Joshua T. Bishop, convicted in the Circuit Court for Dorchester county, at July Term, 1878, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for one year.

In the above case the prisoner on trial pleaded guilty of the offense but alleged that he was insane; the jury found that he was not insane at the time the larceny was committed but was insane at the time of the verdict; His Honor, Judge Irving, after sentence, in view of the circumstance of his insanity, recommended him to Executive clemency.

Pardon granted September 19th, 1878.—Gustavus Petrofsky, convicted in the Circuit Court for Allegany county, at January Term, 1878, of bastardy and sentenced to jail in default of giving bond for the support of the bastard child.

In this case the prisoner was committed to prison and remained there some months for default in giving security to support a bastard child, circumstances occurring later threw such doubt upon his guilt that His Honor, Judge Pearre recommended his release.

Pardon granted September 19th, 1878.—William Barber, convicted in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel county, at April Term, 1876, of manslaughter and sentenced to the penitentiary for five years.

The prisoner in this case had served nearly three years of his term and was pardoned on the recommendation of the Judge before whom he was tried, and also that of the jury; his conduct in prison had been uniformly good.

Pardon granted October 3rd, 1878.—Andrew Kavanaugh, convicted in the Circuit Court for Cecil county, at March Term, 1875, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for seven years; record removed from the Criminal Court for Baltimore city.

This case was recommended to the clemency of the Executive by a large number of respectable citizens, by the jury who tried the prisoner and also by the State's attorney and the Circuit Judge, the Hon Frederick Stump; having served three and a half years of his term he was pardoned on condition that he leave the State.

Pardon granted October 4th, 1878.—Charles, alias, Dick Whitty, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at October Term, 1875, of burglary and sentenced to the penitentiary until the third day of December, 1880.

This prisoner was jointly indicted with Richard Turpin for burglary and sentenced to five years imprisonment; about one year ago Turpin was pardoned on condition that he would leave the State, and representations as to the very bad health of Whitty being made he was released upon the same conditions, having received the recommendations of the prosecutor and the Board of Directors of the penitentiary.

Pardon granted October 24th, 1878.—Chas. E. Jefferson, convicted in the Circuit Court for Talbot county, at November Term, 1875, of burglary and sentenced to the penitentiary for four years.

The petition in this case sets forth that Jefferson was a mere youth at the time of the commission of the offense, and it is supported by the recommendations of a large number of most respectable citizens of the county, including the representatives in the Senate and the House of Delegates. Having served three-fourths of his time, on the endorsement of the State's attorney, he was pardoned on condition that he leave the State, an application has since been made to waive the conditions but it was rejected by the Executive.

Pardon granted October 29th, 1878.—John D. McClelland, convicted in the Circuit Court for Frederick county, at December Term, 1877, of assault and sentenced to jail for twelve months

This prisoner was released from the Frederick county jail on the recommendation of their Honors, Judges Lynch and Bouic, after seven and a-half months imprisonment.

Pardon granted October 31st, 1878.—Hugh McConnell, Mathew Burns, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at May Term, 1875, of burglary and sentenced to the penitentiary until 1883.

These two young men were indicted with another party whose case was removed to Baltimore county; on the advice of their counsel they pleaded guilty and were sentenced for eight years. The case of Stratton, their colleague in guilt, was tried in the county and on conviction he was sentenced for three years at the expiration of his term in November, 1878; the State's attorney for Baltimore city recommended McConnell and Burns to Executive clemency on the ground that not being more guilty than Stratton they had been sufficiently punished; no protest appearing on advertisement they were pardoned.

Pardon granted November 8th, 1878.—Robert Stratton, convicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore county, at October Term, 1875, of burglary and sentenced to the penitentiary for three years.

On the certificate of the uniform good conduct of this prisoner by the Board of Directors of the penitentiary and the further recommendation of the Judge before whom he was tried, Executive clemency was exercised only a few days before the expiration of his sentence.

Pardon granted December 20th, 1878.—Marcus D. Savin, Felix A. Savin, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at January Term, 1878, of conspiracy and sentenced to the city jail for one year.

This was rather a remarkable case; these two young men had always borne an irreproachable character and great sympathy existed for them in the community. It was represented to the Executive that they were not aware of the nature of the transaction to which they were parties; and from the great number of respectable persons who urged their pardon, the Executive was disposed to credit the statement. The State's attorney from Baltimore city while believing in their guilt, thought that in view of the great distress and utter destitution of their families their punishment had been sufficient to meet the ends of justice, and I was disposed to mercy on the same ground and on the further fact that they had served nine months of the sentence. They were commended to Executive clemency by the officers of the company and a large number of the leading merchants and bankers of Baltimore.

Pardon granted December 24th, 1878.—George B. Frank, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at January Term, 1877, of setting fire to his own store and sentenced to jail for two years.

A pardon was granted in this case only a few weeks before the expiration of the sentence on the ground of the prisoner's good character as testified to by many respectable people and the earnest recommendation of the warden and visitors of the jail.

Pardon granted December 26th, 1878.—John Messersmith, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at January Term, 1875, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for six years.

Executive clemency was exercised in this case principally because of the great destitution of the prisoner's family; his wife had become deranged and his children were left destitute and helpless; he had served four years of his time during which his conduct had been exemplary, and he was recommended to clemency by the person whose property was taken and by the jury by whom he was tried.

Nolleprosequi granted December 26th, 1878.—Sluyter Bouchell, indicted in the Circuit Court for Cecil county, at September Term, 1878, for forgery.

The Hon. James B. Groome presented to me the petition in the above case supported by about eight hundred of the leading citizens of Cecil county and also by the State's attorney and the grand jury who found the indictment. It appeared to be the general impression that from his previous good character and gentle disposition the young man did not intend to commit any offense but thought himself justified in his action; the party whose name was forged readily signed the

application, and as there was no loss to anyone it was believed that a nolleprosequi would in no way defeat the ends of justice in this case.

Pardon granted January 7th, 1879.—Frank Brady, convicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore county, at December Term, 1877, of receiving stolen goods and sentenced to the penitentiary for two years and three months.

This prisoner had served more than two years of his term and was recommended by His Honor, Judge Grason, the county delegation and a large number of respectable citizens; he had only two months to serve and was pardoned on condition that he leave the State.

Pardon granted February 7th, 1879.—William Broderick, convicted in the Circuit Court for Allegany county, at July Term, 1878, upon the charge of bastardy and sent to jail in default of bond for the support of the child.

In this case the accused was committed to jail in default of security to provide for the maintenance of his illegitimate child. He was released on the recommendation of the Judge and State's attorney, who state that he is entirely unable to give security and that Executive interference is the only way, under the present law, by which relief can be obtained.

Pardon granted February 7th, 1879.—Alonzo Goodrich, convicted in the Circuit Court for Carroll county, at May Term, 1875, upon three indictments for larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for five years.

Upon presentation of proof by the physician and Board of Directors of the Maryland penitentiary of the utter imbecility of mind of this prisoner, he was pardoned and removed by the authorities to an alms house suitable for one in his helpless state.

Nolleprosequi granted February 25th, 1879.—William Wody, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at January Term, 1878, of attempting to vote illegally, and awaiting sentence.

In this case the accused was charged with attempting to vote illegally, was convicted and moved for a new trial; he was held in prison for nearly one year awaiting sentence, and the facts being presented to the Executive a nolleprosequi was ordered, solely on the ground that even if guilty of the charge, his punishment had already been far more severe than was warranted.

Pardon granted March 1st, 1879.—Catherine Hager, convicted in the Circuit Court for Frederick county, at December Term, 1877, o larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for two years and six months.

In this case the prisoner had served two years of her term and was recommended by His honor, Judge Lynch and by the State's attorney. The latter says: "In this case the prisoner voluntarily convicted herself and was of great aid to the State in the trial of several other prisoners, and I think that Executive clemency should be extended to her."

Nolleprosequi granted March 7th, 1879.—John Shanahan, indicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore county, at September Term, 1878, for assault with intent to kill.

This was a case where, under circumstances of great provocation, the prisoner made the assault. The opinion was unanimous and was expressed by the Judges, that the only effect of the trial would have been to drag before the world the painful story of a young girl of most respectable parents, without advantage to anyone; after a careful examination of the facts the Executive concluded that this was a case where the exercise of the power of granting a nolleprosequi was entirely justifiable.

Pardon granted March 7th, 1879.—John Hooper, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at January Term, 1878, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary until the 21st day of January, 1880.

This pardon was granted after a service of 14 months of the term of imprisonment on the recommendation of a large number of most respectable citizens, and a special letter from the State's attorney of Baltimore city; a letter from the physician showed how hopeless was the condition of the health of one of the parties.

Pardon granted March 11th, 1879.—Wm. E. Bloomer, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at Jauuary Term, 1878, of conspiracy to defraud and sentenced to one year in jail and fined $100.

This case excited great interest and a very large number of most respectable citizens urged the Executive to exercise clemency. He was recommended by the grand and petit jury, the Board of Visitors of the jail, the counsel of the prosecuting railroad company and the physician of the jail in whose office he was placed while in prison; in consideration of the fact that he had served for two months in prison before his trial he was pardoned two months before the expiration of his sentence.

Pardon granted March 21st, 1879.—George McElroy, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at September Term, 1878, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for one year.

The accused pleaded guilty of the offense but there seems to have been many extenuating circumstances that commended him to clemency, among which was his extreme youth. His petition was supported by the Judge who tried him, His Honor, Judge Garey, by the Board of Directors of the penitentiary and most earnestly by the prosecutor. He had served three months of his term.

Pardon granted April 4th, 1879.—Jeremiah Eberly, convicted in the Circuit Court for Washington county, at May Term, 1877, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for three years.

The petition in this case was signed by a very large number of most respectable citizens of Washington county, among whom were the parties who suffered the loss. The State's attorney urged the pardon on the ground that the prisoner had voluntarily returned to the State and pleaded guilty, and further that his term had very nearly expired.

Pardon granted May 3d, 1879.—John Swanger, convicted in the Circuit Court for Garrett county, at September Term, 1878, of assault with intent to kill and sentenced to the penitentiary for eighteen months.

The accused was indicted on three counts and was found guilty of assault with intent to maim and acquitted of the charge of intent to kill; it was represented to me by a large number of citizens of Garrett county that the prisoner had always borne a good character, and he was released after ten months confinement on the recommendations of the two learned Judges before whom he was tried.

Pardon granted July 2nd, 1879.—George Washington Norris, convicted in the Circuit Court for Charles county, at May Term, 1872, of murder in the second degree and sentenced to the penitentiary for ten years.

The prisoner in this case had served seven years of his term and had been earnestly recommended for pardon by the Board of Directors of the penitentiary on account of his uniform good conduct in prison. His Honor Judge Brent, by whom he was sentenced, examined most carefully into the merits of his application, and in writing especially urged me to grant him a pardon.

Pardon granted July 10th, 1879.—George S. Gamble, convicted in the Circuit Court for Baltimore county, at May Term, 1878, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for eighteen months.

The prisoner in this case was found guilty of larceny of some packages of explosive caps for blasting and had served within three months

of the end of his sentence; being recommended by the Board of Directors of the Maryland penitentiary, the Judge before whom he was tried, and his previous good character vouched for by most responsible people he was released.

Pardon granted July 11th, 1879.—Conrad Eichelberger and others, convicted in the Circuit Court for Carroll county, at May Term, 1878, of winning money at cards by a fraudulent conspiracy and sentenced to jail for two years and fined $200 each.

In this case the prisoners had served half their time and were utterly unable to pay the fine imposed. They were released on the recommendation of the grand jury and State's attorney, who stated that the Court also would or had consented to join in an application for their pardon.

Pardon granted July 11th, 1879.—Thos. W. O. Reiley, convicted in the Circuit Court for Washington county, at May Term, 1879, of attempting to poison and sentenced to the penitentiary for two years.

This case was represented to me as a very curious one and the total absence of motive on the part of the prisoner was urged by the State's attorney as a reason for granting a pardon, saying, "had the law given me any discretion I would have abandoned the prosecution;" besides a suggestion from the Court, the prisoner was recommended by numbers of the grand jury and others. By some mistake the prisoner was not released for three months after his pardon was granted.

Pardon granted July 11th, 1879.—Henry Spinner, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at May Term, 1879, of being a common thief and sentenced to jail for six months and fined $50.

At the expiration of two months of this sentence the State's attorney urged upon the Executive the pardon of this young man on the ground that the testimony for the State did not warrant his conviction, His Honor, Judge Pinkney, concurred in this opinion in writing and he was released.

Pardon granted July 24th, 1879.—Thomas Dulaney, convicted in the Circuit Court for Washington county, at November Term, 1876, of robbery and sentenced to the penitentiary for four years.

The Executive was induced to grant a pardon in this case on the recommendation of a large number of the most respectable citizens of Sharpsburgh, where the prisoner lived, on the special suggestion of the State's attorney who prosecuted the case and upon the knowledge of the fact that the person assaulted was long since dead; in addition to these reasons the term of service in prison had expired within a few months.

Pardon granted August 25th, 1879.—Catherine McMurray, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at January Term, 1879, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for one year,

There were two charges of larceny of small value against this prisoner and she was sentenced on the first charge to four months in jail and on the second to one year in the penitentiary; on the expiration of the jail sentence she was recommended to clemency by the Board of Visitors of the jail, on the ground of good conduct, by the physician on account of a serious disease, and especially by His Honor, Judge Pinkney, before whom she was tried; pardon was granted on these recommendations.

Pardon granted September 18th, 1879.—Frank Dailey, convicted in the criminal Court for Baltimore city, at May Term, 1878, of breaking window with intent to steal and sentenced to the penitentiary for three years.

The young man convicted of the above offense was never before charged with any wrong and had served one-half of his term; His Honor, Judge Brown expressed himself as having no opposition to a pardon being granted, and he was released in consideration of the great destitution of a helpless family dependent upon him.

Pardon granted October 2nd, 1879.—Frederick Reich, convicted in the Circuit Court for Carroll county, at May Term, 1878, of rape, and sentenced to the penitentiary for two years.

The State's attorney addressed the Executive and urged the pardon of this prisoner on the expiration of one-half of his term, on the ground that after talking with the Court, he did not think that the circumstances warranted a longer punishment. His release was urged for the same reasons by a large number of the most respectable citizens of Carroll county.

Pardon granted October 9th, 1879.—Jefferson Feelds, convicted in the Circuit Court for Talbot county, at May Term, 1879, of an assault with intent to kill, and sentenced to the penitentiary for two years.

The statement made to the Executive in this case guided him in extending pardon to the prisoner. This statement was to the effect that the evidence was very doubtful and they were divided in opinion as to the offense, whether it was common assault or made with intent to kill, a verdict for the latter was finally rendered with a recommendation for mercy, and under the impression, as stated, that the youth would be sentenced to a few months in the county

jail. Had they thought otherwise this verdict would not have been given. This statement is confirmed by the recommendation of the State's attorney.

Pardon granted October 16th, 1879.—Nicholas Evers, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at May Term, 1879, of assault, and sentenced to jail for six months and fined $50.

Pardon was extended in this case on recommendation of His Honor, Judge Pinkney, and deputy State's attorney after serving five months and payment of the fine.

Pardon granted October 30th, 1879.—Robert Waters, convicted in the Circuit Court for Kent county, at April Term, 1877, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for four years.

The value of the articles stolen in this case was five dollars, for which the prisoner had already suffered two and a-half years' imprisonment. He was recommended by the State's attorney on the ground that he had been sufficiently punished.

Pardon granted October 30th, 1879.—William Jennings, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at January Term, 1879, of being a common thief and sentenced to jail for one year.

This prisoner had served eight months of his term and was released on the recommendation of the Judge before whom he was tried. His family was in a destitute and helpless condition.

Pardon granted October 30th, 1879.—Donaldson T. Woodcock, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at May Term, 1879, of larceny, upon two indictments and sentenced to one year in the penitentiary upon each indictment.

The accused being a very young man, pleaded guilty of two offenses, snatching a pocket book from the hands of ladies in the street and running off with them; there was nothing of value in either pocket book and he was sentenced to serve one year in the penitentiary in each case, having served seventeen months of his term and being deeply repentant, he was recommended to Executive clemency by the prosecuting officer of the State, by one of the ladies who suffered from the offense, and by a number of most respectable citizens, on the ground of his extreme youth and near completion of his sentence.

Pardon granted November 8th, 1879.—Peter O'Neal, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at May Term, 1879, of assault and sentenced to jail for six months.

In this case the prisoner committed an assault on his wife and was pardoned a very short time before his sentence expired, on the special recommendation of the Judge before whom he was tried.

Pardon granted December 11th, 1879.—William Dobbins, convicted in the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, at January Term, 1878, of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for three years.

The prisoner in this case was a mere youth who had taken some old material from the grounds of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, the value of which was about $10. He had served in the penitentiary two years and was recommended to clemency by the officers of the Railroad Company and their counsel, on the ground that the sentence was an extreme one and that he had been sufficiently punished.

MARYLAND HOUSE OF CORRECTION.

(LETTER.)

BALTIMORE, November 27th, 1879.

To his Excellency, John Lee Carroll,
Governor of Maryland:

DEAR SIR:—In compliance with your request, I send you herewith a statement of the amounts expended by the Board of Managers of the Maryland House of Correction, and of which accounts I had charge.

I received my appointment to complete the work from your honorable board on May 27th, 1878, with instructions to prepare the necessary drawings and specifications for the construction of gas works, the heating by hot water or steam, for the cooking and laundry apparatus, and for the preparation of general lists and descriptions of material wanted, and to advertise for proposals on the earliest practicable day. The advertisement was issued in the various papers as directed on June 3rd, 1878, and invited sealed proposals for the following work, closing on the 13th of June, at 12 m., at Barnum's Hotel, where persons interested were invited to attend.

For the construction of the water works, according to plans furnished by R. K. Martin, Esq.

For the construction of gas works.

For the heating of the Institution by either hot water or steam.

For the cooking and laundry apparatus.

For the furnishing of carpets.

For the furnishing of cedar ware.

For the furnishing of mattresses.

For the furnishing of dry goods.

For the furnishing of wrot iron bedsteads.

For the furnishing of general furniture.

The proposals for all the above works were publicly opened on the day named, and the contracts awarded to the lowest responsible bidders in each department as soon as the requisite calculations could be completed. On the same day, (June 13th) the architect was directed to prepare plans and specifications for the pump house in connection with the water works. On September the 10th, 1878, he was

also directed to prepare plans for the drainage and sewer house, the contract for which was let on October the 11th, 1878.

The contracts made by your Board, and purchases consummated by your special committee, were as follows:

With Robert Simpson for the water works	$17,600 00
" Gilbert & Barker, Mfg. Co., for gas machine, &c	2,521 50
" " " " " " gasoline and burners	879 12
" Bartlett, Robbins & Co., for heating by steam	8,980 00
" Thos. C. Basshor & Co., for cooking and laundry apparatus	7,615 00
" McDowell & Co., for carpets, &c	2,191 79
" H. Magraw & Son, and Saml. Child & Co., for cedar ware, &c	467 31
" James L. Frey, for mattresses, &c	1,849 50
" Pearre Bros. & Co., for dry goods	1,214 89
" Dufur & Co., for wrot iron bedsteads	153 00
" John C. Vinipp & Bro., for general furniture	4,049 50
" Shirley & Son, Valiant & Co., and Robt. T. Banks, for china and glass	479 76
" Hutchinson Bros., for range, furniture and grates	321 52
" Domestic Sewing Machine Co., for machines	60 00
" Louis A. Dieter, for shades	277 00
" F. H. Davidson & Co., and J. F. Kerns, for hard and tinware	1,446 99
" Justis & Armiger, cutlery and plate	603 83
' James W. Geddes & Co., galvanized iron ventilators	246 98
" C. Y. Davidson & Co., for gas fixtures	1,405 85
" P. McLaughlin, for gas fitting, &c	407 00
" Thos. Binyon, for carpenter's work	1,913 30
" Thos. C. Basshor & Co., for machinist's tools	240 66
" Jas. A. Pruett, J. Coyle & Bros., and Jas. M. Jones, for stone, slate and paving	399 75
" Robt. Simpson, for drains and sewage	6,480 00
" Geo. A. Frederick, expenses and commissions as architect	1,861 05
" Robt. K. Martin, expenses and commissions as engineer	704 00
Total	$62,508 28

All contracts were satisfactorily completed, and the last accounts open, adjusted and settled by a full meeting of the Board on the 3rd day of April 1879.

With great respect, I have the honor to be,

Your Excellency's most obedient servant,

GEO. A. FREDERICK,

Architect.

STATEMENT

Showing the amount to the credit of, as well as the amounts disbursed from, the Treasury of Maryland, under the provisions of Chapter 260 of 1878, on account of the State House of Correction, as itemized under their proper heads, to wit:

HOW DISBURSED.	Amount.	Total.
By Chapter 260 of 1878, to the credit of		$74,000 00
Disbursed on account of—		
Purchase of land	$1,375 00	
Advertising	151 28	
Lumber	204 96	
Bricks and sand	465 00	
Building railroad track	84 93	
Architect's commissions	1,620 00	
" traveling expenses	361 05	
Labor and materials	1,413 13	
Furniture	13,151 30	
Water supply, drains, cisterns, &c	24,999 75	
Heating and cooking apparatus	17,716 88	
Gas supply	7,227 53	
Board of Managers—incidental expenses	73 75	
Agricultural implements	314 53	
Surveying	90 00	
Books and stationery	660 72	
Clothing and bedding	1,347 74	
Cement	136 28	
Oil and paint	350 51	
Bell	137 50	
Tools	73 83	
Hardware	95 60	
Cart	55 00	
Secretary—salary of	366 46	
Superintendent—salary of	750 00	
		$73,222 73
Balance to the credit of, Oct. 1, 1879		777 27
Total		$74,000 00

A Summary of Expenditures from January 1st, 1879, to September 30th, 1879.

HOW EXPENDED.	Amount.
To Officers' salaries—Physician, Baker and Messenger	$9,073 16
" Subsistence of Superintendent's family and officers	1,277 64
" Subsistence of Board of Managers	428 86
" " Prisoners	3,270 74
" Labor	174 69
" Fuel	1,003 00
" Clothing	623 00
" General expenses	2,067 82
Total	$17,918 91

REPORT

Showing the number of Persons Committed to the House of Correction, and how Discharged, from January 1st, 1879, to September 30th, 1879.

Total number of prisoners committed		407
Discharged by expiration of sentence—Males	141	
" " —Females	77	
Discharged by Courts—Males	9	
" " —Females	5	
Died—Males	1	
" —Females	1	
Pardoned—Males	1	
" —Females	2	
Remaining Sept. 30th—Males	93	
" " —Females	77	
Total	407	407

Average cost per day, per head, for Supt.'s family and officers, 26 c.; prisoners, 8 c.

UNIV. OF MD COLLEGE PARK

3 1430 03833081 9

DEC 75

N MANCHESTER,
INDIANA